



Evaluation Framework

Task Force Meeting
January 4, 2006

Overview from November 30, 2005 Task Force Meeting

- The Task Force...

- Received overview presentation of the process involved in crafting the evaluation framework
- Worked in four small groups to review, discuss, comment on screening criteria
- Reported small group discussion and recommendations to the larger task force
- Charged staff to respond to comments with recommended changes to framework

Staff Response to Task Force

- Staff and Task Force received summary of the Task Force 11-30-05 small group comments
- Staff considered all comments and is recommending changes to incorporate most
- Staff also received comments from InterCEP group
- Approach to reviewing comments tonight:
 - Address screening criteria section by section
 - Within each section, overview of comments and proposed response to criteria
 - Group discussion

Format

- Upcoming slides present proposed criteria changes
- Proposed text changes on slides are color coded to match hard copy criteria in front of you
 - Black text is unchanged from prior versions of criteria
 - Red text- response to Task Force comments¹
 - Blue text- response to InterCEP comments²
 - Green text- represents staff edits³

All proposed changes are also underlined

1. Community Livability and Human Resources

No proposed changes to Criteria 1.1 through 1.5 or 1.7

- 1.1 Minimize adverse impacts to, or reduce noise levels
- 1.2 Minimize adverse impacts to, or enhance neighborhood cohesion
- 1.3 Minimize adverse impacts to, or enhance air quality
- 1.4 Avoid or minimize residential displacements
- 1.5 Avoid or minimize business displacements
- 1.7 Avoid or minimize adverse impacts on public park and recreation resources

1. Community Livability and Human Resources

- 1.6 Avoid or minimize adverse impacts on historic, [prehistoric](#) and cultural resources
- 1.8 Support local comprehensive plans, [including jurisdiction-approved neighborhood plans](#)
- 1.9 [Incorporate aesthetic values of the community in the project design](#)

Discussion

2. Mobility, Reliability, Accessibility, Congestion Reduction, and Efficiency

- 2.1 Reduce travel times and delay on I-5 in the I-5 corridor and within the bridge influence area for passenger vehicles
- 2.2 Reduce travel times and delay on I-5 in the I-5 corridor and within the bridge influence area for transit modes
- 2.3 Reduce the number of hours of daily highway congestion along I-5 within the bridge influence area
- 2.4 Enhance or maintain accessibility of jobs, housing, health care and education to I-5 within the bridge influence area
- 2.5 Improve person throughput of I-5 Columbia River crossing
- 2.6 Improve vehicle throughput of I-5 Columbia River crossing

Discussion

3. Modal Choice

- 3.1 Provide for multi-modal transportation choices
- 3.2 Improve transit service to target markets

No proposed changes to Criteria 3.3 and 3.4

- 3.3 Improve bike/pedestrian connectivity
- 3.4 Decrease percentage of Single Occupancy Vehicle travel

Discussion

4. Safety

No proposed changes to the six safety criteria

- 4.1 Enhance vehicle/freight safety
- 4.2 Enhance bike/pedestrian facilities and safety
- 4.3 Enhance or maintain marine safety
- 4.4 Enhance or maintain aviation safety
- 4.5 Provide sustained life-line connectivity
- 4.6 Enhance I-5 incident/emergency response access within the bridge influence area

Minor edits to Performance Measures for Criteria 4.2 & 4.3

Discussion

5. Regional Economy; Freight Mobility

No Changes to Criteria 5.1 through 5.4

- 5.1 Reduce travel times and reduce delay for vehicle-moved freight on I-5 within the bridge influence area
- 5.2 Reduce travel times and reduce delay for vehicle-moved freight on I-5 through the bridge influence area
- 5.3 Enhance or maintain efficiency of marine navigation
- 5.4 Improve freight truck throughput of the bridge influence area
- 5.5 Avoid or minimize adverse impacts to the parallel freight rail corridor

Discussion

6. Stewardship of Natural Resources

- 6.1 Avoid or minimize adverse impacts to, or enhance threatened or endangered fish or wildlife habitat
- 6.2 Avoid or minimize adverse impacts to, or enhance other fish or wildlife habitat
- 6.3 Avoid or minimize adverse impacts to rare, threatened, or endangered plant species
- 6.4 Avoid or minimize adverse impacts to, or enhance wetlands
- 6.5 Avoid or minimize adverse impacts to, or enhance water quality
- 6.6 Minimize total energy consumption of construction and facility operations
- 6.7 Avoid or minimize adverse impacts to, or enhance waterways

Discussion

7. Distribution of Benefits and Impacts

No proposed changes to Criteria 7.1

- 7.1 Avoid or minimize disproportionate adverse impacts on low income and minority populations
- 7.2 Provide for equitable distribution of benefits to low income and minority populations

Discussion

8. Cost Effectiveness and Financial Resources

- 8.1 Ensure facility construction, maintenance and operation cost effectiveness

No proposed changes to Criteria 8.2

- 8.2 Ensure a reliable funding plan for the project

Discussion

9. Bi-State Cooperation

No proposed changes to Criteria 9.1

- 9.1 Support adopted regional growth management and comprehensive plans

Discussion

10. Constructability

No proposed changes to Criteria 10.1 and 10.2

- 10.1 Maintain transportation operations during construction
- 10.2 Minimize adverse construction impacts
- 10.3 Provide flexibility to accommodate future expansion
- 10.4 Use construction practices and materials that minimize environmental impact

Discussion

Evaluation Framework- Next Steps

- Incorporate Task Force comments from tonight
- Recommendation by Task Force for adoption
- Present final evaluation framework to Project Sponsors Council and InterCEP for adoption
- Turn attention to component screening and alternative packaging